Remarks/Arguments

Claims 1-13 are pending.

Claims 1-13 are rejected.

Claim 6 is currently amended.

Objection to Specification

Applicants submit that the objection to the specification has been overcome by the amendment.

Rejection of Claims Under 35 USC 112, Second Paragraph

Applicants submit that the rejection of Claim 6 has been overcome by the amendment. The amendment changes the dependency of Claim 6 from Claim 1 to Claim 5. Claim 5 provides the necessary antecedent basis for the terms "said interface controller" and "said connector."

In view of the foregoing remarks and amendment, the rejection under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, should be withdrawn.

Rejection of Claims Under 35 USC 102(e)

Applicants submit that for the reasons discussed below, present Claims 1-2 and 4-5 are not anticipated under 35 USC 102(e) by Kreft (US 5,847,372).

Applicants' invention is directed to a computer-controlled device that includes a card reader. The card reader includes an interface controller and a connector wherein the interface controller determines whether the IC card inserted into the card reader is an ISO/7816 or NRSS card and provides the correct interface for the inserted IC card, as disclosed on page 1, line 3 and page 2, lines 1-6 of the specification. More specifically, the interface controller sends a test signal to the IC card and detects a reply to the test signal, as

disclosed on page 2, lines 7-10. The device further includes means for blocking or enabling signals over at least one of the operational contacts in response to the detection of the reply. In this regard, present claim 1 recites: ... means are provided for one of blocking and enabling signals over at least one of said operational contacts in response to said determining means."

By contrast, Kreft discloses **a chip card with several microcontrollers** and the connections to carry out data exchange between different read/write devices. Connecting unit 4 on the chip card decides which microcontroller is to be used based on the configuration of the connections or information available at the connections (col. 2, lines 26-29). The switchover of connections is performed in the connecting unit 4, which is part of the chip card and not the read/write device. Clearly, Kreft's invention is directed to a single chip card that can be used with different terminals for different applications, as disclosed in col. 2, lines 1-3. Thus, Kreft does not address the problem of different IC cards with different standards being used at a single read/write device. Thus, Applicant's invention operates differently to provide a different solution than Kreft. Also, Kreft does not disclose means provided for one of blocking and enabling signals over at least one of the operational contacts that is placed in the card reader in response to determining whether the IC card in the reader has produced a second signal.

In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicants submit that Kreft fails to disclose or suggest features recited in Claim 1, and as such Claim 1 is not anticipated by Kreft and the corresponding rejection under 35 USC 102(e) should be withdrawn. Since Claims 2-6 depend from independent Claim 1, then for the same reasons set forth above with regard to Claim 1, these dependent claims are also allowable over Kreft and the corresponding rejections under 35 USC 102(e) should be withdrawn.

Applicants submit that for the reasons discussed below present Claims 6-12 are not anticipated under 35 USC 102(e) by Lee (US 5,847,372).

Lee is directed to a card read/write reader method. The method is set forth in FIG. 5 and column 5. While Lee addresses determining the type of card being inserted and modifying the reader based on the determination, the operation of Lee does not teach that "*at least one signal path to predetermined ones of the operational contacts is enabled, or at least one signal path is disabled, as a result of whether the responsive signal was determined to be characteristic of the first type or the second type*," as claimed in Claim 7. Claim 6, which depends from claim 1, similarly recites this feature in apparatus form.

Rather, Lee discloses that different files are selected by the reader. Only **after the card-type file is read**, the connection terminals are deactivated. Hence the operational contacts of Lee are not controlled as the result of the responsive signal.

In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicants submit that Lee fails to disclose all of the features of Claim 7, and thus, claim 7 is not anticipated by Lee and the corresponding rejection under 35 USC 102(e) should be withdrawn. Since Claims 8-13 depend from independent Claim 7, then for the same reasons set forth above with regard to Claim 7, these dependent claims are also allowable over Lee and the corresponding rejections under 35 USC 102(e) should be withdrawn. Also, for the same reasons as those discussed above, Applicants submit that claim 6 is not anticipated by Lee and the corresponding rejection under 35 USC 102(e) should be withdrawn

Rejection of Claims Under 35 USC 103(a)

Applicants submit that for the reasons discussed below present Claim 3 is patentably distinguishable over the teachings of Kreft in view of Morrison (US 6,601,238). The Examiner relies on Morrison for a teaching of a NRSS type card. However, Morrison does not teach the deficiencies of Kreft set forth above. Thus, Applicants submit that Morrison fails to cure the defect of Kreft as applied to claim 3, and claim 3 is patentably distinguishable over the combination of Kreft and Morrison.

Applicants submit that for the reasons discussed below present Claim 13 is patentably distinguishable over the teachings of Lee in view of Morrison (US 6,601,238). The Examiner relies on Morrison for a teaching of a NRSS type card. However, Morrison does not teach the deficiencies of Lee set forth above. Thus, Applicants submit that Morrison fails to cure the defect of Lee as applied to claim 13, and claim 13 is patentably distinguishable over the combination of Lee and Morrison

Having fully addressed the Examiner's rejections it is believed that, in view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, this application stands in condition for allowance. Accordingly then, reconsideration and allowance are respectfully solicited. If, however, the Examiner is of the opinion that such action cannot be taken, the Examiner is invited to contact the applicant's attorney at (609) 734-6815, so that a mutually convenient date and time for a telephonic interview may be scheduled.

Respectfully submitted,

C. Worrell, et al.

By: _____

Paul P. Kiel,
Reg. No. 40,677
Phone (609) 734-6815

Patent Operations
Thomson Licensing Inc.
P.O. Box 5312
Princeton, New Jersey 08543-5312
October 28, 2004

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this amendment is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as First Class Mail, postage prepaid, in an envelope addressed to Mail Stop Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 on:

10/28/04
Date

Lori M. Klewin
Lori M. Klewin